App. F. IX-4

1927.

File No. 200-27

Previous References (Madras)

Serial Nos. 1—4

Later References -5-1-8. Law 16-38-1-4.

ex. (19)

Mad Dis. 22 of 29-31 Mad 162-37-143.

Law 110-29-1.

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Law 97-39 (1-13)

Serial Nos. 4

Part B for Mad 1928

SUBJECT

Petition from Somapuram Thiruvaiyaru praying that the Cutcha of Arcot of Village of Byravanahalli may be sold in public auction, accepting his offer of Rs. 3001— as the first bid

G.O. No. 33 dated 9. 7. 1928

To the Madras Govt.

The recommendation of the Dy Comr endorsed by the Madras Govt is approved

4 MUZRI
D85 9
mwr 200-27-1

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE.

3629

1927.

Order.

No. 1979

Name of Petitioner J. S. Thimmappiah

Village Bhyramahalli Fo

Taluk Hariharpur

District Chitaldroog

Date of Petition 9.12.27

Date of Receipt

No. of Enclosures... nil

ABSTRACT.

Chief Secretary
to Govt with Compliments.
B.O.
26/12/27

PRIVATE SECRETARY,
TO THE DEWAN OF MYSORE.

prays that the village of Bhyramahalli may be resumed by Government and the rights of cultivation of the lands sold to the ryots as it is now illegally taken possession by ~~Submitted~~ one Ranganatha Murthy

Submitted.
28/1
Fo 1.

AV 4/1/28

8.2. To mem Case No 1144 & 19.1.28
calls for report with records on the above.

GVS 27/1/28

WD 2424—GPB—1,000—1-6-27

General and Revenue Secretariat. | File No. of 192

Serial No.

From, The Inam Comr., Letter no PC 186 Dy 23rd may 1928.

Recommends that the inam Village of Byrenahalli in question may be taken back from Katte Narasimhachar, and leased out for 5 years by auction for the benefit of Sri Harihareswara Swamy temple, an adequate cash-remuneration being fixed for the Parana Service in the temple for which it is intended.

✓ The D C's Letter i/c S 9 t received with the In C's Letter under disposal, explains the facts of the case fully.

2 The Village of Byrenahalli is a Devadaya inam originally granted for Purana [illegible] in the temple At the time of the inam Settlement, it was in the special enjoyment of one Lakshmi Bayi, wife of Appanacharya, Sixth in descent from the original Grantee Lakshmi Narasimhachar. Katte Narasimhachar is the present holder of the inam

A copy of Grant Registered.

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

WD 01714—GPB—30,000—18-4-28

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 207 of 1927.

Serial No.

who is unconnected with the [illegible] family, states that the latter has leased out to his ancestors on "mulgani" tenure on condition that the lessee should render Purana Service in the temple & that the inam has been in the possession of his family for over 100 years, but has not furnished any evidence in support of his long enjoyment. On the other hand, it is seen from the inam register that the inam has once resumed & sold in 1881 for non-performance of Purana Service, but subs. gratuity restored in 1882. So that the undisturbed possession of Katte Nara Simhachar's family begins from this year.

4 In his statement dt 17.6.27, the present holder — Katte Narasimha Murthyachar states among other things, that the inam is yielding an income of Rs 300/, that he has engaged one Venkatachar for reciting Purana in the temple on a pay of Rs 12/ per mensem

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

WD 01714—GPB—30,000—18-4 28

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 200 of 192 7

Serial No.

It is thus clear that the ... village is in the ... enjoyment of ... not himself perform the ... Service, but is enjoying a large ... & portion of its income.

The M.C. states that this one of the cases which came to his notice during his inspection of the Sub-Taluk, and recommends that the village may be taken back from its present holder Nara Simha Murthyachar & leased out for 5 years by auction - an adequate cash remuneration being fixed for Purana Service in the temple.

There is an offer of Rs 500/- from the Complainant in this case.

Submitted for orders

Dy. No. 6. 1928. 6 The land is a

20/6/28 Devadayam Inam. It is granted for the benefit of Purana Service. The value of the land is therefore prima facie equal to the value of the service to be performed. The value of the land is ... The value of this service appears to be quite disproportionate to the value of the service now required to be performed for

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

WD 01714—GPE—30,000—18-4-28

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 200 of 192

Serial No.

The land is not enjoyed by the persons originally connected with the land. He had been removed by force, but this order was cancelled in 1882. One of the idea of first was to deprive the appellant of all benefits out of the land. This order never not have been cancelled & the person could not have been allowed to be in possession. A period of 26 years has elapsed after that order has been issued & the appellant is in possession of the land. True he does not perform the duty himself. But it does not seem to be proper to deny him any sort of concession. If he is to be considered as not entitled to enjoy the land as not performing the duty & as an absentee, he may be given the option on account of enjoyment of the land for a fairly long period, of the land as a lessee at least on a suitable portion, and the lease sanctioned only after he agrees to avail himself of the concession.

7 First Member

22/6.

JUN 1933
No 7456

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

WD 01714—GPB—30,000—18-4-28

1589

App. F. III—2

General and Revenue Secretariat. Mad File No. 200 of 1327.

Serial No. 8

This is a Devadaya Inam for the performance of Purana service in this temple. The present holder of this Inam Village is not personally performing this Service nor is he the descendant of the person who was the holder at the time of the Inam Settlement. Accordingly he has no kind of right to hold the Village or to claim & arrange for the performance of the Service in the temple from the income he realises from ~~him~~ the Village. The Inam is part of the Devadaya Lands of the temple and the best arrangement for the performance of the Purana Service is for Court to lease it out on behalf of the temple and employ a person for rendering the said Service and pay him a monthly remuneration from the income of the temple including the annual Gulla of this Village. In these circs the recommendation of the Dy Cr endorsed by the M C is approved

If the present holder of the Village is prepared to pay annually the gulla which the Dy Cr considers reasonable in view of the conditions of the lands and offers to take them on lease for cultivation he may be permitted to hold them as a lessee for five years

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 200 of 1927

Serial No.	
1D	DR G.O. Submr AG 4.7.28 Rs 47 25 11 Dom WD 4/7
4	Lo. mer Comr No 32 dt 1/7 Appreces your desproposal subject to mer Comr

B

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

WD 01714—GPB—30,000—18-4-28

A, P. F. VI. Gl]

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Section Mem

File No. 200-2

Serial No. 2

No. 1144 Mem

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *192*

To The Inam Com^r

Date of issue 19/1/28

Signed by Venkatarama Ayyar

Sir,

I am directed to forward herewith for an early report with records, petition no. 859 from Sompuvada Thimmappa of Harihar complaining of the unauthorized alienation of the Devadaya inam village of Byrenahalli endowed to Sri Harihareswara Swamy temple at Harihar, and praying that the suit may be sole

over

List of enclosures.....

Copied by .....

Examined by .....

in public auction as per
Standing order, accepting
his offer of the 500/- as
his first bid.

I have etc.

DD) Sec. Lecky

13/1/28

M. C. 13]

OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER IN MYSORE,

Bangalore.....192

No. Pe. 186 Enclose
25-6.

'25

FROM

The Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

D 1537

To



SIR,

With reference to [illegible] January 1928 [illegible] Sompurada Thimmappiah of [illegible] alienation of the Devadaya Inam village of [illegible] Harihareswaraswamy temple at [illegible] village may be leased out [illegible] accepting his offer of Rs.500/- [illegible] submit herewith copy of letter No. [illegible] from the Deputy Commissioner, Chitaldrug [illegible] in the circumstances detailed in the Deputy Commissioner's letter, the Inam village may be resumed and leased out [illegible] for the benefit of the temple, [illegible] the Purana service in the temple.

I may mention that [illegible] notice in the course of my inspection [illegible] action is the result of an order [illegible]

The connected [illegible] Sub Division office and enclosed.

I have the [illegible]

Ra Narasimhaiengar
Asst Commissioner

(Absent from Stations)

[illegible]

"With reference to [illegible] Parakkal [illegible] Perumal temple at Mandali, I have [illegible] file of correspondence on the subject [illegible] Division Officer's No.P.D.C.30/[illegible] petition of Lakshmi Pathi [illegible] and to state as follows:-

The village of Parakkal [illegible] grant of certain services in the village [illegible] enjoyment of one Talaiyari Pai, [illegible] the original grantee - Kollari Vanan[illegible] the present holder of the [illegible] village to his ancestors on "Kudimai Pattam" [illegible] lessee should arrange for the performance of [illegible] and that in virtue of this lease, he like his predecessors [illegible] for the puranic service in the temple and in addition [illegible] further states that the inam is in possession of his family [illegible] years but he has not produced any document [illegible] It is however seen from the remark made in column [illegible] that Lakshmi Pai leased out the village on [illegible] one Inami Krishnaswami [illegible] If it was transferred to the ancestors of Kollari Vanan[illegible] by him, it must have been in the same character [illegible] It would also appear from the inam register that the [illegible] to Government in 1801 on account of non-performance [illegible] subsequently restored in 1862. From this it should be presumed that [illegible] under valid hereditary service only from 1862 [illegible] Patte Parakkalmannan and his ancestors are [illegible] of Kollari Parakkalmannan and in fact subsequent [illegible] lapse of time it is clear that the possible [illegible] took place subsequent to 1862 and at that [illegible] to the land. In case a portion [illegible] loss on account of this village not having been leased out [illegible] other lands. [illegible] book from Tahsildar [illegible]

years [illegible] derived from [illegible] Department.

It [illegible]

G.R.S. VI G 34]

SUBJECT.....

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

, *the* 192 .

Date of issue.....

Signed by.....

May this be

i Printed ?

ii treated as a standing order ?

iii published in the Gazette, English Part ?

iv translated ?

v placed at the disposal of the press ?

vi published in the Gazette, Kannada Part ?

Section

File No.

Serial No.

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore

Read—

Order Thereon, No.

forwarding a copy of the Chairman's D/ 1-5-28 to C No A VC 1576 & 26-27 D/ 6th May 1928 and

AG

RB

temple which has been put up[illegible]

The D.C, Chitaldrug Distt. accepts the allegations Complained of

The inam village in question may be resumed and leased out for 5 years by auction for the benefit of the temple, an adequate cash remuneration being fixed for the Puraana Service in the temple. for which the inam is intended.

Under 33 § 9-1-28 the rule

[Please copy in full the member's minutes in para 8 of the office note.]

This is a document then ... for four years

List of enclosures.

Yours faithfully Secy

4-7-28

To The Asst. Comr.

Copied by

Examined by

WD 1888—GPB—1 000 00—21 12 23

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore.

Read.-

Petition No. 859 dated the 9th December 1927 from Sompurada Thimmappiah of Harihar complaining of the unauthorized alienation of the Devadaya Inam village of Byranahalli, endowed to Sri Harihareswaraswamy temple at Harihar.

2. Correspondence ending with letter No. P.C.186 dated 23rd May 1928 from the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore forwarding a copy of the Chitaldrug Deputy Commissioner's letter No. A5. C.1576 of 1926-27 dated 6th May 1928 and recommending that, as the village in question is a Devadaya Inam granted to the Sri Harihareswara Swami temple which has been put to a great loss on account of the alienation complained of, the Inam village in question may be resumed and leased out for 5 years by auction for the benefit of the temple, an adequate cash remuneration being fixed for the Purana Service in the temple for which the Inam is intended.

Order No. 33 | Mus 200

Dated, Bangalore, the July 1928.

This is a Devadaya Inam for the performance of Purana Service in this temple. The present holder of this Inam village is not personally performing this service nor is he the descendant of the person who was the holder at the time of the Inam Settlement. Accordingly he has no kind of right to hold the village or to claim to arrange for the performance of the Service in the temple from the income he realises from the village. The Inam is part of the Devadaya lands of the temple and the best arrangement for the performance of the Purana Service is for Government to lease it out on behalf of the temple and employ a person for rendering the said service and pay him a monthly remuneration from the income of the temple including the annual gutta of this

village. In these circumstances the recommendation of the Deputy Commissioner endorsed by the Muzrai Commissioner is approved. If the present holder of the village is prepared to pay annually the Gutta which the Deputy Commissioner considers reasonable in view of the conditions of the lands and of offer to take them on lease for cultivation he may be permitted to hold them as a ~~lessee~~ lessee for five years.

for Secretary to Government,
Financial Department.

To

The Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore (returning enclosures)